

**CEQA FINDINGS, FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS  
FOR FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT No. 37-03**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 Statutory Requirements for Findings**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), (Public Resources Code § 21081) and the CEQA Guidelines ("the Guidelines") (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15901) require that no public agency approve or carry out a project for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects of the project on the environment unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale of each finding. The possible findings, which must be supported by substantial evidence in the record, are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
- (2) Changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

For those significant effects that cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the public agency is required to find that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.

In addition, CEQA requires a public agency to make a finding that the EIR reflects the public agency's independent review and judgment. In accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the Guidelines, the Long Beach Planning Commission ("the Commission") expressly finds that the Final Environmental Impact Report, Final EIR 37-03 (SCH No. 200309112), for Long Beach Airport (LGB) Terminal Area Improvement Project reflects the Commission's independent review and judgment.

Final EIR 37-03 identifies significant or potentially significant environmental effects prior to and after mitigation which may occur as a result of approval of the Proposed Project. In accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the Guidelines, the Commission adopts these Findings as part of its certification of Final EIR 37-03.

In conjunction with its adoption of these Findings, the Commission has reviewed and considered a substantial amount of material including, but not limited to, the following:

- a. Draft EIR 37-03 and all appendices and technical reports thereto;
- b. Comments and Responses to Comments on Draft EIR 37-03, including a list of all persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting;
- c. Transmittal packages to the Long Beach Planning Commission;
- d. Minutes of the Long Beach Planning Commission meetings;
- e. Planning Commission Resolution Nos. ~~06-XX~~ adopted on May 4, 2006;

- f. All attachments and documents incorporated by reference identified in items a. through e. above.

## **1.2 Organization/Format of Findings**

In compliance with the statutory requirements, the Findings are organized as follows:

- (1) Effects found not to be significant;
- (2) Effects which were determined to have been mitigated to below a level of significance;
- (3) Significant effects that cannot be mitigated to below the level of significance;
- (4) Cumulative effects determined not to be significant;
- (5) Significant cumulative effects;
- (6) Feasibility of project alternatives;
- (7) Optimized Flights; and
- (8) Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Each of these categories is accompanied by: a discussion of significant effects; project design features, standard conditions and regulations, and mitigation measures relevant to the specific effects being considered; Findings; and facts in support of those Findings.

## **1.3 EIR Process**

EIR 37-03 was prepared as a Project EIR pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The City has taken steps to encourage the public to participate in the environmental process. An Initial Study was prepared to focus the environmental resources to be analyzed in the EIR. The City prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) pursuant to section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines requesting input from agencies and the public regarding the appropriate scope of the EIR. The NOP was posted on the City's website and circulated for a 30-day public review period on September 22, 2003. The review period was closed on October 23, 2003. Public scoping meetings were held to solicit public input on October 11 and October 16, 2003. The meetings were held at the Long Beach Energy Department Auditorium on Spring Street in Long Beach. Notices of the scoping meetings were published in five local publications. Approximately 100 people attended the Saturday (October 11) scoping meeting and approximately 200 people attended the Thursday (October 16) scoping meeting. In addition, the City received 251 responses to the NOP (a combination of letters, postcards, and emails).

Recognizing the intense public interest, the City Council referred the scope of project and the scope of the EIR to the Airport Advisory Commission (AAC) for consideration. Though not part of the formal EIR scoping process, the AAC held 15 meetings, open to the public, from November 2003 through July 2004 to consider recommendations on possible Airport improvements and to advise on certain issues regarding scoping of the EIR. The AAC made recommendations regarding the project and technical studies to be prepared for the EIR. The City Council considered these recommendations on February 1 and February 8, 2005. As a result of this process, changes were made to the proposed improvements that would constitute the Proposed Project and be addressed in the EIR.

A new NOP, reflecting the project, as defined by the City Council, was prepared to solicit input on the scope of the EIR. The NOP was distributed to 84 agencies, individuals, and groups on April 14, 2005, for a 32-day review period. In addition, a notice that the NOP was available and

posted on the City website was mailed to 274 individuals. The comment period on the NOP closed on May 16, 2005. Scoping meetings were held at the Long Beach Department of Energy Auditorium on Spring Street on Thursday, April 28 and Saturday, May 7, 2005. Notice for these meetings was included on the NOP and published in six local publications. Approximately 59 people attended the April 28, 2005, scoping meeting and approximately 78 people attended the May 7, 2005, scoping meeting. In addition, the City received 80 responses to the NOP (a combination of letters, postcards, and emails).

The Draft EIR was circulated for an 84-day public review and comment period beginning November 7, 2005, and ending January 30, 2006. The Draft EIR was made available through a number of sources. Paper copies of the document or compact disks with the electronic files of the document were sent to 200 public agencies and individuals. In addition, the document was posted on the City's website and sent to the local libraries. Copies of the document were at each of the 12 Long Beach libraries and the main libraries in the Cities of Lakewood and Signal Hill. Notices of Availability of the document were sent to 160 members of the public and published in 6 local publications.

A series of public meetings were held to provide the public an overview of the findings of the Draft EIR, as well as to take testimony on the document. The public meetings were held on November 29, 2005, at The Grand; December 3, 2005, in the City Council Chambers; and December 5, 2005, at the Petroleum Club in Long Beach. In addition, a joint workshop with the Long Beach Planning Commission and the Long Beach Cultural Heritage Commission was held on December 15, 2005. Public testimony was also taken at the workshop. During the public review period a total of 215 written comments were received (a combination of letters, comment cards, and emails) on the Draft EIR. Written responses to comments were prepared for all written comments received, as well as to the comments raised in public testimony at the four public meetings. Copies of the comments received, as well as the written responses to comments were sent to each of the commenting agencies and posted on the City's website. Notices of Availability of the Responses to Comments were sent to 665 public agencies and members of the public.

The Final EIR was sent to the Long Beach Planning Commission for certification of compliance with CEQA.

#### **1.4 Effects Not Evaluated in the EIR**

The Initial Study determined there would be no significant effect for several topical areas. Therefore, these issues do not warrant further evaluation in the EIR. These topical areas are identified below.

Aesthetics – The project is not located within the viewshed of a designated scenic vista or state scenic highway. The project would not impact any trees or rock outcroppings. However, other aesthetic considerations were evaluated as part of the EIR.

Agricultural Resources – The Proposed Project would not result in any impacts to farmlands listed as "Prime," "Unique," or of "Statewide Importance" based on the 2002 Los Angeles County Important Farmland Map prepared by the Department of Conservation.

Biological Resources – The proposed Airport improvements would be constructed on a portion of the Airport that is currently developed/paved to support airport-associated activities. The project would not have any direct impact on biological resources because it would not result in the removal of any sensitive habitat or impact any sensitive species. The project would not change the type of operations or operational procedures at the Airport; therefore, the project would not result in substantial interference with the movement of wildlife or migration of birds.

Geology and Soils – The area of the proposed improvements is relatively flat and, with the exception of Parcel O, is currently covered by an impervious surface. Construction activities would expose the underlying soils; however, the overall area exposed would be limited. The project site would not be prone to geotechnical constraints such as slope instability, landslides, or liquefaction. Additionally, a recent geotechnical survey conducted by the City of Long Beach for the existing parking structure at the Airport concluded that the potential for the site to be significantly impacted by earthquakes, seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, substantial soil erosion, or unstable or expansive soil is limited. No septic tanks are proposed as part of the project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials – The project would not result in a significant hazard from the transport of hazardous materials, nor would the project alter the Airport's practices regarding the handling of hazardous materials, fueling, or other maintenance or operational procedures. The project is consistent with the provisions of the Airport Land Use Plan. The project would not alter or interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site is not located in an area subject to wildland fires.

Hydrology and Water Quality – The Proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in impervious soil or result in increased runoff. Only development of Parcel O would result in the increase of impervious area. This development would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or affect the quality or quantity of the groundwater table. Compliance with the applicable permits issued pursuant to the Federal Clean Water Act would address the long-term water quality issues associated with the Proposed Project.

Land Use and Planning – The Proposed Project would not result in any direct impacts to an established community because all improvements would occur on site. There is not an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan adopted for the project area.

Mineral Resources – The project site has not been identified by the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) as having mineral commodities in sufficient quantities to be mined commercially.

Population and Housing – The Proposed Project would not result in the displacement of housing or a large number of people. The Proposed Project would not result in increased flight levels or substantially increase employment levels that would result in an increased demand for housing in the area.

Public Services – The project would not increase the demand on public schools, parks, or other public services because it would not result in a population increase in the project area.

Recreation – The project would not generate any increase in population or provide development that would result in increased usage of existing neighborhood and regional parks. There would not be any physical deterioration to existing recreation facilities due to the project.

Utilities and Service Systems – Though the project would be expected to have an incremental increase in water demand and wastewater production because there would be additional facilities, this would only result in slight increases in peak flow rates. The overall increases would not be substantial enough to require expansion of existing facilities. As part of a routine plan check, a Fire Flow Test may be required, though based on discussion with the Long Beach Water Department, the 12-inch water main in Lakewood Boulevard would have sufficient capacity to provide necessary water supply to meet demand.

The project would have the potential to increase the amount of solid waste both through construction and operation of the new facilities. Though the number of passengers would be consistent for each of the project alternatives, it is reasonable to assume that additional waste would be generated with the new facilities because there would be increased concessions and

better facilities where passengers may be more inclined to use the concession areas. However, this incremental increase would not be expected to result in a significant impact. The City of Long Beach has developed programs to divert the amount of refuse that is sent to landfills through waste reduction, recycling, and business and government source reduction programs. Additionally, a standard specification in all City contracts requires that the contractor recycle such construction wastes so these materials are not disposed of in landfills.

### **1.5 Location and Custodian of Documents**

Section 7.0, References, of the Draft EIR contains a list of all references used in preparation of the environmental analysis. Much of the reference materials are located at the City of Long Beach Department of Planning and Building, which serves as the custodian of the documents constituting the record of proceedings upon which the City of Long Beach has based its decision related to the project. The contact for this material is:

Ms. Angela Reynolds  
City of Long Beach Department of Planning and Building  
333 West Ocean Boulevard  
Long Beach, California 90802  
(562) 570-6354

References not available at the City of Long Beach, Department of Building and Planning, are available at BonTerra Consulting, Inc. and are available for review by appointment. The contact information is:

Ms. Kathleen Brady  
BonTerra Consulting  
151 Kalmus Drive, Suite E-200  
Costa Mesa, California 92626  
(714) 444-9199

### **1.6 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan**

As required by Public Resources Code (PRC) § 21081.6, the City of Long Beach, in adopting these findings, also adopts the project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). The MMRP is designed to ensure that, during implementation of the project, the City and other responsible parties will comply with the adopted mitigation measures, summarized within these findings, as well as in the Draft EIR, Section 6.0, Summary of Mitigation Measures. The mitigation program identified to reduce potential project impacts consists of project design features, standard conditions and requirements, and mitigation measures. These components, which are described below, are all included within the MMRP.

- **Project Design Features** – Project Design Features (PDFs) are specific design elements proposed by the project applicant and are incorporated into the project to prevent the occurrence of, or reduce the significance of, potential environmental effects. Because PDFs have been incorporated into the project, they do not constitute mitigation measures as defined by CEQA. However, PDFs are identified in the mitigation section for each topical issue to ensure that they are included in the mitigation monitoring program to be developed for, and implemented as a part of, the Proposed Project.

- **Standard Conditions and Requirements** – Standard conditions and requirements are based on local, state, or federal regulations or laws that are frequently required independently of CEQA review. They also serve to offset or prevent specific impacts. Typical standard conditions and requirements include compliance with the provisions of the Uniform Building Code (UBC), South Coast Air Quality Management District Rules (SCAQMD), local agency fee programs, etc. Additional conditions may be imposed on the project by government agencies during the approval process, as appropriate.
- **Mitigation Measures** – Where a potentially significant environmental effect has been identified and is not reduced to a level considered less than significant through the application of PDFs and standard conditions and requirements, project-specific mitigation measures have been recommended.

The City of Long Beach hereby finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Program meets the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code by providing a monitoring program designed to ensure compliance during project implementation with mitigation measures adopted by the City of Long Beach.

## **2.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT PROPOSED FOR APPROVAL**

### **2.1 Introduction**

#### **2.1.1 Physical Facilities and Passenger Levels**

The Long Beach Airport has been in existence since 1923. Presently, the Airport covers 1,166 acres and has 5 runways, the longest being 10,000 feet. The Airport serves commercial carriers, general aviation, and air cargo. The area surrounding the Airport is a mix of commercial, industrial, and residential development.

The existing Airport Terminal Building was built in 1941 for DC-3 aircraft and served approximately 25,000 annual commercial airline passengers. In 1984 a new concourse area and pre-boarding lounge were constructed immediately south of the existing Airport Terminal Building to provide capacity for 15 daily flights; better accessibility for patrons with disabilities; improved mobility in the passenger screening process; and improved ticketing and check-in processing of Airport users. At the time, the Airport was serving approximately 1.1 million annual passengers (MAP). The aircraft flown were predominately the MD-80 and B737.

Between August 2001 and 2003, the number of passengers using the Airport increased from 600,000 to almost 3.0 MAP. This increase was predominately due to an increase in the number of commercial flights; however, the aircraft size and load factors have also increased over the past two decades. Because existing facilities were not adequate to accommodate this level of activity, the Airport constructed a temporary holdroom, a temporary remote parking lot, and a new baggage claim area in 2002. A second temporary holdroom was added in 2003.

#### **2.1.2 Regulatory Setting**

In 1981, the City of Long Beach adopted a noise control ordinance affecting the Airport which limited the number of air carrier flights at the Airport to 15 flights per day and required the use of quieter aircraft. The purpose of the ordinance was to reduce the “cumulative” noise generated by the Airport. The ordinance was challenged by the commercial airlines in federal court. Following an injunction by the court, the City formed a task force and prepared an Airport Noise Compatibility Program, pursuant to Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations.

In an effort to resolve the protracted litigation, the City and the airlines entered into a stipulated settlement agreement. Under the settlement, the City Council would adopt a new Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. This was enacted as Chapter 16.43 of the Municipal Code and permits

air carriers to operate a minimum of 41 airline flights per day while commuter carriers are permitted to operate a minimum of 25 flights per day. There are provisions in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance allowing the number of flights to be increased if the air carrier flights and commuter flights operate below their respective Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) limits.

In 1990, while the City's appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals was pending, Congress passed the Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA), which limited an airport operator's right to control Stage 3 aircraft. Included within the ANCA legislation is a "grandfather" provision which permits the City to continue to enforce the flight and noise restrictions that are contained in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance (Chapter 16.43). In May 2003, the FAA reaffirmed the "grandfather" status of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance under ANCA.

## **2.2 Project Description**

The Proposed Project provides improvements to the existing Airport Terminal Building and related facilities in order to accommodate recent increases in flight activity at the Airport consistent with operational limitations of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance and the 1995 Settlement Agreement. The Proposed Project includes construction of, or alteration to, the 13 areas listed below:

- Holdrooms
- Concession Area
- Passenger Security Screening
- Baggage Security Screening
- Baggage Claim Devices
- Baggage Service Office
- Restrooms
- Office Space
- Ticketing Facilities
- Airline Gates
- Aircraft Parking Positions
- Vehicular Parking
- Traffic and Pedestrian Circulation

The terminal area improvements are being designed to accommodate the demand based on the minimum requirements of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. This would include the 41 airline flights and 25 commuter flights, passengers associated with those flights, and security requirements imposed by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA). The 41 airline and 25 commuter flights provided for in the Ordinance would result in approximately 4.2 MAP being served at the Airport. Considering all improvements, the size of the Airport terminal space would increase from 56,320 square feet to 102,850 square feet. The terminal area would be designed to ensure improvements are compatible with the existing historic Airport Terminal Building and would not compromise the historic integrity of the building. The guiding principles for the project design include: (1) the May 7, 1990, Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) by the Neighborhood and Historic Preservation Officer for the City of Long Beach, which provides guidelines for future environmental review of the Airport Terminal Building. The MOU includes as an attachment the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings; (2) the Development and Use Standards for the Long Beach Airport Terminal Planned Development Plan Ordinance adopted by the City Council on September 2, 1997; and (3) a Memorandum of Considerations for new construction prepared by PCR dated June 22, 2005. These documents are included in Appendix B of the EIR. Additionally, there is a commitment to construct the new facilities to meet high standards for energy efficiency and environmental design consistent with the LEED standards.

In addition to new construction and the removal of the temporary modular buildings that have been brought in to provide additional holdroom space, modifications to the interior of the Airport Terminal Building would be required to maximize efficiency of the floor space. This would include relocation of ticketing and concession areas and opening the center of the Airport Terminal Building to the proposed new holdroom area. Covered open areas would also be provided. The preliminary concept plan shows covered areas for the baggage make-up area (where the airlines receive screened bags from TSA, which are then sorted and loaded onto baggage carts), the baggage claim area, ticketing and queuing, and an area for "meeters and greeters." These areas would have a roof structure but not side enclosures. Precise uses would be determined during project design. Additional space will be added according to Table 2-1 below.

**TABLE 2-1  
LONG BEACH AIRPORT PASSENGER TERMINAL AREA IMPROVEMENTS  
EIR ALTERNATIVES**

Description	Proposed Project	Existing Conditions
<b>Holdrooms</b>		
Permanent Space <sup>1</sup>	6,500 sf	6,500 sf
Temporary Space <sup>2</sup>	0 sf	13,150 sf
Proposed Additional Space <sup>3</sup>	21,171 sf	0 sf
Subtotal	27,671 sf	19,650 sf
<b>Passenger Security Screening</b>		
Existing	3,900 sf	3,900 sf
Proposed Additional Space	7,000 sf	0 sf
Subtotal	10,900 sf	3,900 sf
<b>Concession Area</b>		
Permanent Space <sup>1</sup>	5,460 sf	5,460 sf
Proposed Additional Space <sup>3</sup>	9,541 sf	0 sf
Subtotal	15,001 sf	5,460 sf
<b>Baggage Security Screening</b>		
Baggage Security Screening	7,000 sf <sup>4</sup>	5,000 sf
<b>Baggage Claim Devices</b>		
Passenger Side	510 lf	226 lf
Airline Loading Side	310 lf	180 lf
Subtotal	820 lf	406 lf
Baggage Service Office	900 sf	0 sf
Multi-Purpose Rooms	300 sf	0 sf
Subtotal	1,200 sf	0 sf
<b>Restrooms (non-secure)</b>		
Permanent Space <sup>1</sup>	1,330 sf	1,330 sf
Temporary Space <sup>2</sup>	0 sf	0 sf
Proposed Additional Space <sup>3</sup>	2,000 sf	0 sf
Subtotal	3,330 sf	1,330 sf
<b>Office Space</b>		
<b>TSA</b>		
Temporary Space	3,600 sf	3,600 sf
Proposed Additional Space	1,590 sf	0 sf
Subtotal	5,191 sf	3,600 sf
<b>Airlines (Operations Offices)</b>		
Permanent Space	2,000 sf	2,000 sf
Temporary Space	0 sf	0 sf

Description	Proposed Project	Existing Conditions
Proposed Additional Space	3,754 sf	0 sf
Subtotal	5,754 sf	2,000 sf
<b>Airport (Office &amp; Conference)</b>		
Permanent Space	6,970 sf	6,970 sf
Temporary Space	0 sf	0 sf
Proposed Additional Space	5,000 sf	0 sf
Subtotal	11,970 sf	6,970 sf
Subtotal for Office Space	22,915 sf	12,570 sf
<b>Ticketing Facilities</b>		
Ticket Counter Area (Existing)	1,250 sf	1,250 sf
Proposed Additional Space	680 sf	0 sf
Subtotal	1,930 sf	1,250 sf
Ticket Counter Queuing (Existing)	1,400 sf	1,400 sf
Proposed Additional Space	1,400 sf	0 sf
Subtotal	2,800 sf	1,400 sf
Airline Ticket Office (Existing)	4,360 sf	4,360 sf
Proposed Additional Space	243 sf	0 sf
Subtotal	4,603 sf	4,360 sf
Circulation - Ticketing (Existing)	1,400 sf	1,400 sf
Proposed Additional Space	4,100 sf	0 sf
Subtotal	5,500 sf	1,400 sf
Subtotal for Ticketing Facilities	14,833 sf	8,410 sf
Total	102,850 sf	56,320 sf
<b>Airline Gates and Parking Positions</b>		
Airline Gates	11	8
Aircraft Parking Positions	12 to 14	10
<b>Vehicular Parking</b>		
Permanent Non-Leased Spaces	2,835	2,835
Leased Spaces	0	0 <sup>6</sup>
Proposed Additional Spaces	3,451 <sup>6</sup>	0
Total	6,286	2,835
sf square feet lf linear feet <sup>1</sup> Permanent floor space in Airport Terminal Building and permanent 1984 holdroom building <sup>2</sup> Temporary floor space in modulars <sup>3</sup> Temporary (modular) space would be replaced with permanent facilities <sup>4</sup> The February 8, 2005 City Council action reflected a range of square footage for these areas. The lower end is presented here. Up to 3,000 square feet may be added for a total of 10,000 square feet of new space. <sup>6</sup> The existing leased spaces would be replaced with new parking structure. <sup>6</sup> The leases for the parking spaces are short-term leases. Current discussions with Boeing indicate that these spaces would not be available on a long-term basis.		

## 2.3 Project Objectives

The key objective of the Proposed Project is to provide Airport terminal facilities to adequately accommodate the minimum number of flights provided for in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance and the number of passengers served by those flights. To meet this objective, the project design must provide for the following:

- Maximize safety and security of passengers, visitors, and tenants by adhering to TSA, FAA, and all other applicable state and local standards including the City's fire, building, and safety codes.

- Ensure that project sizing and design of the improvements is in keeping with the parameters of the adopted Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance.
- Maintain and enhance the current character of the Airport Terminal Building as a Long Beach Cultural Heritage Landmark by creating an environment in which the design of the new facilities respects the architectural and aesthetic character of the existing Airport Terminal Building.
- Provide uncomplicated, operationally, and energy-efficient, value-driven design within a plan that can be developed in incremental stages.

### 3.0 EFFECTS DETERMINED NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

This section of the findings summarizes the potential effects found not to be significant upon implementation of the Proposed Project. The summary of the environmental effects found not to be significant is based on the environmental analysis provided in the Final EIR, Section 3.0 (Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures).

#### 3.1 Aesthetics

The Final EIR found that implementation of the Project would result in certain significant aesthetic impacts, which are addressed in Sections 4.1 (mitigable impacts), below. However, certain visual impacts evaluated in the Final EIR were found to be insignificant due to specific design attributes and/or features of the Project. The following paragraphs identify and describe those aesthetic impacts determined to be insignificant following evaluation.

**3.1.1 Finding:** Implementation of the Project would not result in aesthetics impacts associated with the below-mentioned threshold.

- *Inconsistent with applicable plans and policies as set forth by the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and Planned Development Ordinance.*

**3.1.2 Facts in Support of Finding:** The Final EIR evaluated the potential for inconsistencies with applicable plans and policies and determined there would not be significant impacts because the following project design features and standard conditions had been incorporated into the project design:

PDF 3.1-1 The Guiding Principals have been used in the development of the conceptual design plan. As part of final design, the requirements outlined in these documents, which are named below, would provide guidance to protect the historic integrity of the existing terminal. This also serves to ensure a unified appearance and enhance the aesthetics of the terminal area. The Guiding Principals include: (1) May 7, 1990, memorandum of understanding (MOU) by the Neighborhood and Historic Preservation Officer for the City of Long Beach providing guidelines for future environmental review of the Airport Terminal Building; (2) Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation of historic buildings; (3) Development and Use Standards for the Long Beach Airport Terminal Planned Development Plan Ordinance adopted by the City Council on September 2, 1997; (4) the City's Cultural Heritage Ordinance (Chapter 2.63 of the Municipal Code); and (5) a memorandum on considerations for new construction prepared by PCR (June 22, 2005). These documents all provide guidance on development standards for terminal area improvements and are included in Appendix B.

SC 3.1-1 Prior to building plan approval, the Planning Commission shall ensure that all development complies with the development standards and design guidelines

contained in Ordinance No. C-7496, *Development and Use Standards for the Long Beach Airport Terminal Planned Development Plan (PD-12)*.

- SC 3.1-2 Prior to building plan approval, the Cultural Heritage Commission shall ensure that any new construction proposed adjacent to the Terminal Building or attached onto it shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic buildings, and more specifically, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards).
- SC 3.1-3 Prior to building plan approval, the Cultural Heritage Commission shall ensure that all development shall comply with the May 7, 1990 MOU adopted by the City Council and Cultural Heritage Commission providing guidelines for future environmental review of the Airport Terminal Building (the MOU is contained in Appendix B).

### **3.2 Air Quality and Human Health Risk Assessment**

The Final EIR found that implementation of the Project would result in certain significant air quality and human health risk impacts, which are addressed in Sections 4.2 (mitigable impacts) and Section 5.1 (mitigable impacts), below. However, certain air quality and human health risk impacts evaluated in the Final EIR were found to be insignificant due to specific design attributes and/or features of the Project. Though not identified as significant impacts, the Final EIR also recommended mitigation measures that would allow the potential impacts to be reduced even further. The following paragraphs identify and describe those air quality and human health risk impacts determined to be insignificant following evaluation.

**3.2.1 Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in air quality and human health risk impacts associated with the below-mentioned thresholds.

- *Construction emissions for the other criteria pollutants (CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) in excess of standards established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District.*
- *Expose of receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.*
- *Result in an incremental (future alternative compared to 2005 Baseline) cancer risk greater than 10 in one million (1 x 10<sup>-5</sup>) or a hazard greater than one for residents, school children, and off-airport workers.*
- *Exceed occupational standards developed or adopted by Cal/OSHA for airport workers.*
- *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.*

**3.2.2 Facts in Support of Finding:** The Final EIR evaluated the potential for air quality and human health risks and determined there would not be significant impacts in the above-stated categories because the Proposed Project would not result in any additional flights or passengers; as a result, it would not alter the operating characteristics of the Airport. Compared to the existing baseline, the Proposed Project would not result in increased air emissions or cancer risk. The Proposed Project would provide beneficial air quality effects because project design features have been incorporated into the Proposed Project which would reduce emissions associated with aircraft operations and ground support equipment. Standard conditions would also apply that would reduce potential air emissions. These measures are outlined below:

- PDF 3.2-1 As part of project design, the City of Long Beach shall ensure the terminal area improvements are designed and constructed to meet LEED specifications.
- SC 3.2-2 In support of PDF 3.2-1, requiring the design and construction of the terminal improvements to meet LEED standards, building materials, architectural coatings and cleaning solvents shall comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations.
- SC 3.2-3 In support of PDF 3.2-1, requiring the design and construction of the terminal improvements to meet LEED standards, all new and substantially modified buildings shall meet California Title 24 Energy Efficiency standards for water heating, space heating and cooling, to the extent feasible.
- SC 3.2-4 All new and modified point source facilities (e.g., utility equipment, fuel storage and dispensing) shall obtain all required permits from the SCAQMD. To obtain these permits, the facilities will need to include Best Available Control Technology (BACT) that reduces emissions of criteria pollutants.
- SC 3.2-5 In support of PDF 3.2-1 and to conserve energy, require that all exterior lighting use color-corrected low sodium lighting.
- MM 3.2-3 The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce general contractors sweep streets as needed during construction, but not more frequently than hourly, if visible soil material has been carried onto adjacent public roads.
- MM 3.2-4 The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce general contractors to visually inspect construction equipment prior to leaving the site; loose dirt shall be washed off with wheel washers as necessary.
- MM 3.2-11 During project design, the architect shall provide that all fixtures used for lighting exterior common areas are regulated by automatic devices to turn off lights when they are not needed.
- MM 3.2-12 As part of the air carrier ramp design, the City of Long Beach shall incorporate electric charging stations infrastructure to support operation of electric GSE and other on-airport vehicles.
- MM 3.2-13 As part of the air carrier ramp design, preconditioned air and 400 Hz power from electric units (or electric power grid) will incorporate provisions at the commercial passenger aircraft parking positions to allow aircraft pilots the ability to plug in at the gate and turn off the APU.
- MM 3.2-14 The City shall require the use of ultra-low sulfur diesel for diesel-fueled equipment that are not readily convertible to electrical power on all future lease and operational agreements for air carriers.

### **3.3 Cultural Resources**

The Final EIR found that implementation of the Project would result in certain significant cultural resources impacts, which are addressed in Sections 4.2 (mitigable impacts), below. However, certain cultural resource impacts evaluated in the Final EIR were found to be insignificant due to lack of known or anticipated resources on the project site, specific design attributes and/or features of the Project. The following paragraphs identify and describe those cultural resources impacts determined to be insignificant following evaluation.

**3.3.1 Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in Cultural Resources impacts associated with the below-mentioned thresholds.

- *Grading and construction activities that would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource determined to be "unique" or "historic."*
- *Results in the direct or indirect destruction of a unique or important paleontological resource or site.*

**3.3.2 Facts In Support of Finding:** The Final EIR evaluated the potential for cultural resources impacts and determined that impacts for the above-stated categories would be less than significant because the results of the record search indicate that there are no previously recorded archeological sites within a one-mile radius of the project site and there are no recorded vertebrate fossil localities within the Proposed Project boundaries. Potential for impact to resources of this nature are very low, especially given the disturbed nature of the project site. Additionally, standard conditions for construction projects, which are outlined below, would apply in the event resources are inadvertently discovered during construction.

SC 3.3-1 Should any archaeological resources be uncovered during grading or excavation activities, these activities shall be diverted to a part of the site away from the find, and a qualified archaeologist shall be contracted by the contractor to: (1) ascertain the significance of the resource; (2) establish protocol with the project applicant to protect such resources; (3) ascertain the presence of additional resources; and (4) provide additional monitoring of the site, if deemed appropriate. If human remains are discovered on the site, the Los Angeles County Coroner shall be contacted to examine the remains, and the provisions of Section 15064.5(3) of the CEQA Guidelines shall be followed.

SC 3.3-2 If human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition of the materials pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendent (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The descendent must complete the inspection within 24 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.

SC 3.3-4 Should any paleontological resources be uncovered during grading or excavation activities, the construction contractor shall divert activities to a part of the site away from the find, and a qualified paleontologist shall be contracted by the contractor to: (1) ascertain the significance of the resource; (2) establish protocol with the project applicant to protect such resources; (3) ascertain the presence of additional resources; and (4) provide additional monitoring of the site, if deemed appropriate. If human remains are discovered on the site, the Los Angeles County Coroner shall be contacted to examine the remains, and the provisions of Section 15064.5(3) of the CEQA Guidelines shall be followed.

### 3.4 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Final EIR found that implementation of the Project would result in certain significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials, which are addressed in Sections 4.3 (mitigable impacts), below. However, certain potential impacts evaluated in the Final EIR were found to be insignificant due to site conditions, specific design attributes, and/or features of the Project. The following paragraphs identify and describe those hazards and hazardous materials impacts determined to be insignificant following evaluation.

**3.4.1 Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with the below-mentioned thresholds.

- *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and as a result would create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment.*
- *Be inconsistent with the applicable goals, objectives and requirements of the City of Long Beach Public Safety Element or Strategic Plan 2010.*

**3.4.2 Facts in Support of Finding:** The Final EIR evaluated the potential for impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials and determined that impacts for the above-stated categories would be less than significant for the following reasons:

- *The Proposed Project would not be constructed in an area with a site identified on the Cortese List and those locations on the Cortese List in proximity to the Proposed Project site have been identified and remediated in accordance with State and local standards.*
- *The City has achieved on-going compliance with Industrial and Construction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for the Airport. In addition, the City conducts tenant education programs as part of its Industrial Permit.*
- *Since adoption of the Public Safety Element in 1975, actions have been taken to remove incompatible uses from the Airport area. Additionally, new underground storage tanks installed to replace older tanks have been designed with state-of-the-art spill and leak mitigation, tank integrity monitoring, and secondary containment systems.*

In addition, project design features and standard conditions, which are outlined below, would apply to the projects. Though not a significant impact, the Final EIR also recommended a mitigation measure that would further help to reduce impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials.

PDF 3.4-1 The proposed terminal improvements would be constructed in a manner consistent with LEED standards certification requirements to, among other things, minimize potential hazards and hazardous waste impacts.

SC 3.4-1 The Proposed Project and any additional flights associated with optimize flight operations would be required to comply with the provisions of the *Long Beach Airport Certification Manual* and *Long Beach Airport Rules and Regulations* pertaining to the handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes.

SC 3.4-2 The Contractor shall develop a SWPPP to minimize potential short-term significant hazardous materials impacts associated with construction activities.

- SC 3.4-4 The Airport shall comply with the Airport Industrial NPDES permit (CAS000001/WDID 4B19S004985). Construction activities that disturbs more than one acre shall abide by the State issued State Water Resources Control Board Order 99-08 General Permit CAS000002. As part of this process, the Airport would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).
- SC 3.4-5 Construction of the Proposed Project shall be in compliance with local and State construction and building requirements and regulations, including the Uniform Building Code.
- MM 3.4-3 During demolition and excavation activities and during preparation of the geotechnical study in the design phase, the City shall have a qualified inspector onsite to inspect and sample the soil for contaminants. If observations during demolition activities indicate that site soil is affected by contaminants, demolition work should be stopped in the area involved until an analysis of the soil conditions can be performed and additional recommendations evaluated and performed as necessary.
- MM 3.4-6 The City Engineer, or his designee, shall verify that every contractor transporting or handling hazardous materials and/or wastes during project implementation has permits and licenses from all relative health and regulatory agencies to operate and properly manifest all hazardous or California regulated material.
- MM 3.4-7 Prior to initiating construction activities, the contractor shall verify the locations of underground pipelines in the terminal area, ramp, and parking areas. Appropriate precautions shall be taken to ensure that pipelines are not disturbed or are properly relocated during construction.

### **3.5 Land Use and Relevant Planning**

**3.5.1 Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in land use and relevant planning impacts associated with the below-mentioned thresholds.

- *Conflict with applicable land use plans, policies or programs of an agency with jurisdiction that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.*
- *Conflict with the policies of the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG's) Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCP&G).*
- *Inconsistent with the applicable goals, objectives, and requirements of the City of Long Beach General Plan and its Elements, Zoning Ordinance and the Planned Development Ordinance and Strategic Plan.*
- *Displacement or induced airport land use beyond the Airport boundary.*

**3.5.2 Facts in Support of Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with the applicable land use plans, policies, or programs adopted by the City of Long Beach, SCAG, and the FAA. The Proposed Project is consistent with the provisions of the General Plan, applicable zoning, the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, the Long Beach Strategic Plan 2010, SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, and FAA Part 77.

### 3.6 Noise

The Final EIR found that implementation of the Project would result in certain significant noise impacts, which are addressed in Sections 4.4 (mitigable impacts), below. However, certain of the noise impacts evaluated in the Final EIR were found to be insignificant due to site conditions, specific design attributes, and/or features of the Project. The following paragraphs identify and describe those noise impacts determined to be insignificant following evaluation.

**3.6.1 Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in significant noise impacts associated with the below-mentioned thresholds.

- *Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan, Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, and applicable standards of State and Federal Agencies.*
- *A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels which exist without the project.*

**3.6.2 Facts in Support of Finding:** The Final EIR found that when compared to existing conditions, the Proposed Project would not result in noise levels in excess of the applicable standards for the Airport. Fifteen residential units are currently within the 65 to 70 CNEL contour. These units are exposed to noise levels in excess of applicable state standards; however, these impacts are not a result of the implementation of the improvements outlined as part of the Proposed Project. The operation of the Airport Terminal improvements would not increase the number of units exposed to noise levels in excess of state or federal standards. Therefore, the operation of the Airport Terminal improvements would not result in any impacts associated with these thresholds.

Parcel O long-term use would be as a tie-down and hangar area for general aviation aircraft. Activity in this area would primarily be the taxiing of aircraft to and from the tie-down area to the runways. The closest point of this tie-down area to the homes across Clark Avenue is about 1,000 feet. At the nearest homes across Clark Avenue, the noise levels estimated are a maximum noise level 51 dBA (thrust necessary to overcome inertia) and a taxiing noise level of 48 dBA. These operations would meet the requirements of the Long Beach Noise Ordinance.

The EIR identified the following standard condition which would apply to the Proposed Project and would serve to protect against significant noise impacts.

**SC 3.6-1** The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance would apply to continued operations at the Airport. All future operations would need to be consistent with the provisions of the ordinance.

Additionally, the Final EIR recommended a mitigation measure designed to address existing aviation noise that affects homes within the 65 CNEL contour. These impacts are not project-related but are an existing condition. Though mitigation is not required because there is not a nexus between the impact and the Proposed Project, the EIR recommended that the City of Long Beach adopt the following mitigation measure to address the noise impact associated with the flight levels permitted under the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance.

**MM 3.6-2** Within 24 months of certification of the EIR, the Airport Manager shall develop a land use compatibility program addressing existing and future aviation noise levels. The program shall be an ongoing voluntary program that will provide noise attenuation and be available to all residential units within the 65 CNEL contour and schools within the 60 CNEL contour based on the contours published for Long Beach Airport for the previous calendar year (Quarterly Report for 12 month

Period Ending December 31). In exchange for sound insulation treatment, the owners of the property will provide the City of Long Beach an avigation easement over said property. The program shall identify (1) methods of providing noise attenuation; (2) funding sources for the improvements; (3) methods for establishing priorities for implementing the improvements; and (4) an installation agreement. The land use compatibility program will be administered by the City of Long Beach, Airport Bureau.

### **3.7 Public Services**

**3.7.1 Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in public services impacts associated with the below-mentioned thresholds.

- *Inconsistency with the policies of the General Plan pertaining to public services related to the Airport.*
- *Substantial increase in demand for public service at the Airport, which cannot be met by existing staffing.*
- *Inadequate emergency access at the Airport.*
- *Inadequate security as determined by TSA.*
- *Conflict with Airport and FAA standards and regulations.*
- *Result in an air or ground safety hazard.*

**3.7.2 Facts in Support of Finding:** Construction of the Proposed Project would not result in the intrusion of safety hazards at the Airport. All construction activities would comply with standard City and FAA construction requirements. City standard conditions require the contractor to submit plans to the Police and Fire Departments prior to initiating work to ensure sufficient access is provided and safety standards are met at all times. With implementation of this standard condition, there would be no impacts.

The design of all facilities would implement applicable City and Uniform Building Codes, as well as TSA requirements. Implementation of these design standards would ensure that the structures meet the requirements for emergency access and fire suppression requirements (i.e., sprinkler systems). The Proposed Project would conform to the policies and intent of the *General Plan Public Safety Element* in that it would provide a more secure environment for the screening of baggage and passengers. Improvements would reduce the possibility of safety hazards related to overcrowding.

Staffing levels of Airport security, police, fire, and TSA are based on the number of passengers and flights at the Airport, and not the facilities themselves. Based on discussion with service providers, the EIR determined the new facilities would not result in a substantial increase in demand for fire or police service at the Long Beach Airport.

The following project design feature, standard conditions, and mitigation measures for public services would apply to the Proposed Project.

**PDF 3.7-1** The Proposed Project and the build scenarios include a number of features that would enhance public safety and security at the Airport. These features would reduce overcrowding and provide an expanded baggage screening area, which would also be enclosed to protect sensitive screening equipment.

- SC 3.7-1 Prior to the initiation of construction activities, the City's contractor shall prepare a Traffic Control Plan to ensure that adequate emergency access is maintained at the Airport during construction. As part of the Traffic Control Plan the contractor shall alert emergency and security service providers of the construction activities for each phase of construction. The Traffic Control Plan shall be submitted to the City Traffic Engineer for approval.
- SC 3.7-2 During project design, the facility improvements shall adhere to TSA, FAA, and all applicable standards including City of Long Beach fire code, building code, and safety code. Long Beach Fire Department shall review and approve design plans as part of the site plan review and building permit processes.
- MM 3.7-1 During construction activities, the relocation or modification of TSA facilities shall be coordinated with TSA to ensure that there is no compromise to the TSA function that would adversely affect TSA's ability to perform its passenger and baggage security screening activities.
- MM 3.7-2 Prior to initiation of any modifications to the airfield side, the contractor shall provide a Construction Phasing Implementation Plan, meeting the approval of the Airport Manager. The Plan shall demonstrate how construction activities will be conducted and that all applicable FAA airfield safety requirements are being met. In addition, the contractor shall prepare a safety plan and participate in on-going weekly safety meetings during construction.

### **3.8 Transportation and Circulation**

**3.8.1 Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in any transportation and circulation impacts.

**3.8.2 Facts In Support of Finding:** Construction workers would generate approximately 50 peak hour trips during the most active construction period. The workers would generate approximately 50 trips during the morning peak-hour (50 in and 0 out) and 50 trips during the afternoon peak-hour (0 in and 50 out), with all workers parking on site. The construction-related truck trips that occur while the peak numbers of employees are present would be minimal, with construction materials being delivered in the off-peak hours. Due to the minimal number of trips being generated, no significant impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required. However, SC 3.7-1 would require the contractor to prepare a Traffic Control Plan to ensure adequate emergency access is maintained at the Airport during construction.

Under the "Existing Plus Proposed Project" scenario, there would not be any additional trips because no additional flights or other attractions would be provided. The number of trips is associated with the number of passengers and flight levels. As a result, the expected traffic volumes associated with the "Existing Plus Proposed Project" scenario would be generally the same as existing conditions. This scenario would not create an undesirable peak hour level of service (LOS) at any key intersections. The Proposed Project would not alter the travel routes currently used by Airport patrons.

The following project design features and standard conditions would apply to the Proposed Project and would minimize traffic at the Airport.

PDF 3.8-1 A component of the Proposed Project is the provision of a new parking structure that would accommodate 4,000 vehicles.

- PDF 3.8-2 The project would also include the extension of the south side of the Donald Douglas Drive loop to exit onto Lakewood Boulevard, with eastbound right turn only to southbound access on to Lakewood Boulevard.
- PDF 3.8-3 With the construction of the parking structure existing surface parking would be displaced. To address potential parking demand during construction, Parcel O would be developed to serve parking demand not met by existing facilities.
- SC 3.8-1 As part of contract specification, the Airport shall require all construction trucks to access the Airport terminal area via the I-605 to I-405 and Lakewood Boulevard. Should oversized-transport vehicles accessing the Project site use a State highway, a Caltrans transportation permit will be required. Construction vehicles accessing Parcel O shall use this route and access the construction site off of Clark Avenue or Willow Street.

#### **4.0 EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE MITIGATED TO BELOW A LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The following section sets forth the effects of the Proposed Project, as approved, determined to be mitigated to below a level of significance, and identifies one or more of the *required findings* that states facts in support of those findings with respect to each effect.

##### **4.1 Aesthetics**

**4.1.1 Significant Effects:** When compared to existing conditions, the Proposed Project has the potential to result in the following aesthetic impacts that were identified as significant or potentially significant impacts:

- The Proposed Project would alter views of the project site during construction activities, potentially resulting in short-term aesthetic impacts. Implementation of MM 3.1-1 and MM 3.1-2 would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.
- The Proposed Project would result in construction activities and expansion of the terminal facilities. This could result in light and glare impacts associated with security lighting and light emanating from the proposed improvements. The short-term and long-term light and glare impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of MM 3.1-2 through MM 3.1-4.

**4.1.2 Finding:** The Planning Commission adopts the following Finding:

- *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment*

**4.1.3 Facts in Support of Finding:** The significant impacts associated with Aesthetics can be mitigated to a level considered less than significant with implementation of the following mitigation.

**MM 3.1-1** During construction activities, the construction contractor shall ensure that construction materials and equipment staging areas be located away from existing residential uses and, when feasible, appropriate screening (i.e., temporary fencing with opaque material) shall be used to buffer views of the construction site.

- MM 3.1-2 During construction activities, the construction contractor shall ensure that temporary construction-related security lighting shall be arranged so that direct rays will not shine on or produce glare for adjacent street traffic and residential uses. The light fixtures specified for the Project design must comply with the standard of the Illuminating Engineering Society for full cutoff capability.
- MM 3.1-3 Prior to building plan approval, the Planning Commission shall ensure that all exterior lighting be designed and located as to avoid intrusive effects on the runway operations, so as not to result in an air safety hazard. Low-intensity street lighting and low-intensity exterior lighting shall be used throughout the development to the extent feasible. Lighting fixtures shall use shielding, if necessary to prevent spill lighting on adjacent off-site uses.
- MM 3.1-4 Prior to building plan approval, the Planning Commission shall ensure that all development projects use reflective glass that is less than 20 percent and all other materials used on exterior buildings and structures shall be selected with attention to minimizing reflective glare.

## 4.2 Cultural Resources

**4.2.1 Significant Effects:** The Proposed Project would result in alterations to a designated historical landmark that would be considered significant. Development of the Proposed Project is consistent with the Guiding Principles (Appendix B), and implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 3.3-1 through MM 3.3-6 and Standard Condition SC 3.3-3 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level considered less than significant.

**4.2.2 Finding:** The Planning Commission adopts the following CEQA Finding:

- *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.*

**4.2.3 Facts in Support of Finding:** The EIR found that the above Significant Effects regarding Cultural Resources would be mitigated to a level considered less than significant if the mitigation program below is implemented.

PDF 3.3-1 The Guiding Principals have been used in the development of the conceptual design plan. As part of final design, the requirements outlined in these documents, which are named below, would provide guidance to protect the historic integrity of the existing terminal. The Guiding Principals include: (1) May 7, 1990, memorandum of understanding (MOU) by the Neighborhood and Historic Preservation Officer for the City of Long Beach providing guidelines for future environmental review of the Airport Terminal Building; (2) Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation of historic buildings; (3) Development and Use Standards for the Long Beach Airport Terminal Planned Development Plan Ordinance adopted by the City Council on September 2, 1997; (4) the City's Cultural Heritage Ordinance (Chapter 2.63 of the Municipal Code); and (5) a memorandum on considerations for new construction prepared by PCR (June 22, 2005). These documents all provide guidance on development standards for terminal area improvements and are included in Appendix B of the EIR.

SC 3.3-3 In compliance with Chapter 2.63 of the Municipal Code no permits for the alteration, remodel, enlarging, or improvements to the Airport Terminal, shall be issued prior to review by the Cultural Heritage Commission and issuance by the Commission of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

- MM 3.3-1 If the proposed Airport Terminal improvements are to be connected to the original 1941 structure, then the project architect shall design the connection between the new structure and the existing Airport Terminal Building so that it is attached beneath the existing cornice, to be consistent with the Streamline Moderne design.
- MM 3.3-2 If during final design, new windows are required in the existing Airport Terminal Building, the project architect shall ensure that window treatments reference the style of the original Airport Terminal windows, which are very specific to the Airport Terminal. The use of the window wall, as seen on the northwest and southwest corner, shall be used as an example.
- MM 3.3-3 If during the final design, window replacement is proposed for the original Airport Terminal Building, then the new window(s) shall replicate the original style of fenestration. If the original windows that are currently missing from the building are still extant, then those windows shall be returned to their original location, if feasible.
- MM 3.3-4 If during final design, new doorframes in the Airport Terminal Building are proposed, then the project architect shall reference the style of the original doorframes located on the east and south facades of the original Airport Terminal Building for the new doorway(s).
- MM 3.3-5 The City of Long Beach, Public Works Director or designee shall stipulate in the plans and specifications that exterior material should be compatible in type, color and finish to the existing material used on the Airport Terminal Building. Testing should be done to determine original colors, if necessary. Implementation of this mitigation measure will be at the direction of the Cultural Heritage Commission.
- MM 3.3-6 If during final design, the shelter/ticketing areas are proposed on either side of the existing 1941 Airport Terminal Building, then the project architect shall scale down the proposed design. This could be accomplished with a lower profile, possibly with a flat roof that fits in visually with the horizontal nature of the architectural style of the terminal. The manner in which this mitigation measure will be implemented shall be reviewed by the Cultural Heritage Commission as part of the issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

#### **4.3 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**4.3.1 Significant Effects:** When compared to existing conditions, the Proposed Project has the potential to result in significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials. These impacts, which are listed below, would be mitigated to a level considered to be less than significant with the implementation of standard conditions and mitigation measures.

- During construction, asbestos-containing materials could be disturbed and introduced into the environment. This impact would be reduced to a level considered to be less than significant with implementation of SC 3.4-3, MM 3.4-1, and MM 3.4-5.
- During construction, lead-based paint could be introduced into the environment. This impact would be reduced to a level considered to be less than significant with implementation of MM 3.4-1 and MM 3.4-2.

- During grading activities at Parcel O, aerially deposited lead could be introduced into the environment. This impact would be reduced to a level considered to be less than significant with the implementation of MM 3.4-1 and MM 3.4-8.
- During grading activities at Parcel O, DDT could be introduced into the environment. This impact would be reduced to a level considered to be less than significant with the implementation of MM 3.4-1 and MM 3.4-8.

**4.3.2 Finding:** The Planning Commission adopts the following CEQA Finding:

- *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.*

**4.3.3 Facts in Support of Finding:** The EIR evaluated the following areas and found that the potential effects from Hazards and Hazardous Wastes could be mitigated to a level considered less than significant with adoption of the mitigation program described below.

**SC 3.4-3** The Airport Terminal Building is known to contain asbestos containing materials (ACM). The applicant shall comply with notification and asbestos removal procedures outlined in SCAQMD Rule 1403 to reduce asbestos-related health issues.

**MM 3.4-1** Prior to the initiation of demolition/construction, the Contractor shall develop an approved Health and Safety Contingency Plan (HSCP) in the event that unanticipated/unknown environmental contaminants are encountered during construction. The plan shall be developed to protect workers, safeguard the environment, and meet the requirements of the CCR, Title 8, General Industry Safety Orders – Control of Hazardous Substances. The Plan shall include measures for handling any unknown wastes or suspect materials discovered during construction by the Contractor, which he/she believes may involve hazardous waste or hazardous materials.

The HSCP should be prepared as a supplemental to the Contractor's Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan, which should be prepared to meet the requirements of CCR Title 8, Construction Safety Orders.

**MM 3.4-2** Prior to the demolition of any on-site building or portion of any on-site building constructed prior to 1973, the City shall screen the buildings for lead-based paint. If lead-based paint is identified, mitigation shall be developed in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local regulatory requirements.

**MM 3.4-4** As part of the contract specification, a haul route, which could include Willow Street, shall be designated by the City Engineer, or his designee. During construction, the City Engineer, or his designee shall instruct every contractor that no hazardous or acutely hazardous materials may be transported onto the Airport via Willow Street to avoid potential impacts within one-quarter mile of the Alpert Jewish Community Center, where school programs are conducted.

**MM 3.4-5** Prior to demolition of any facilities at Million Air, the applicant shall test for asbestos containing materials. Should ACM or asbestos concrete pipe be found, the applicant shall comply with notification and asbestos removal procedures outlined in SCAQMD Rule 1403 to reduce asbestos related health risks.

**MM 3.4-8** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall test the soil for aerially deposited lead and dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT). As a result of soil testing, should aerially deposited lead or DDT be found in quantities that exceed

acceptable thresholds, the applicant shall develop a remediation program to dispose of soil material properly.

#### 4.4 Noise

**4.5.1 Significant Effect:** Night construction activity on Parcel O may result in noise levels in excess of the noise levels specified in the Long Beach Noise Ordinance if heavy construction equipment associated with grading and paving are used. This impact would be reduced to a level considered to be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-1.

**4.5.2 Finding:** The Planning Commission adopts the following CEQA Finding:

- *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.*

**4.5.3 Facts in Support of Finding:** According to the EIR, implementation of the following standard condition and mitigation measure would mitigate the noise impact to a level considered to be less than significant:

**SC 3.6-2** The contractor shall comply with the City of Long Beach Noise Ordinance pertaining to limitations on construction activities, as outlined in Exhibit 3.6-12 of the EIR, to the extent feasible while minimizing any potential conflicts with aviation activities.

**MM 3.6-1** The City shall conduct noise measurements during any night construction on Parcel O where such construction involves the use of heavy construction equipment such as front loaders, tractors, graders, paving machines, jackhammers, or similar devices. Such measurements shall be made near the homes located directly across Clark Avenue from Parcel O. If any night measurement exceeds the limits specified in Sections 8.80.150 and 8.80.160 of the Long Beach Municipal Code as a result of the construction activity, the operation shall be terminated until such time that a construction noise mitigation plan can be put into effect that will result in compliance with the night time noise limits. Note that in the case where ambient noise levels exceed the noise limits specified in Section 8.80.160, the allowable noise exposure standard shall be increased per Section 8.80.150 [C] of the Municipal Code to reflect ambient levels.

#### 5.0 **SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO BELOW THE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The following section sets forth the significant unavoidable effects of the project, as approved. With respect to each effect, it identifies one or more of the required findings, states facts in support of those findings and, as appropriate, refers to the City's Statement of Overriding Considerations.

#### 5.1 Air Quality

**5.1.1 Significant Effect:** Project-related construction activities would result in a significant short-term, construction-related air quality impact for NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC, which would contribute to an existing air quality violation.

The EIR identifies temporary air quality impacts that would result from project construction activities that would violate ambient air quality standards and would contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Construction equipment and construction worker

vehicles would emit air pollutants. Fugitive dust would be generated during demolition and construction activities in the terminal and parking areas. Peak construction day emissions would exceed Southern California Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) thresholds of significance for NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC. When combined in the presence of sunlight, VOCs react with NO<sub>x</sub> to form ozone, a criteria pollutant for which the Southern California Air Basin (SCAB) is in non-attainment. Consequently, project-related construction activities would contribute to an existing air quality violation. It should be noted that these impacts would be short-term, occurring only during construction of the Proposed Project and would not result in the violation of any ambient air quality standard.

**5.1.2 Findings:** The Planning Commission adopts the following CEQA Findings:

- *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.*
- *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the Environmental Impact Report.*

**5.1.3 Facts in Support of Findings:** The following facts or mitigation measures indicate that the identified significant effects of the project have been reduced or avoided to the extent feasible. Although changes and alterations were incorporated into project design, and mitigation measures have been adopted to substantially avoid or mitigate significant environmental effects, the short-term construction Air Quality Impacts remain significant and unmitigable. Pursuant to Section 15091(a)(3) of the Guidelines, there are no feasible measures that would mitigate the impacts to below a level of significance. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, however, the Planning Commission has determined that the significant effects are acceptable because of the specified overriding economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations.

The mitigation program below is adopted and incorporated as part of the project to minimize the air quality impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

SC 3.2-1 During construction of the Proposed Project, the City and its contractors will be required to comply with regional rules, which would assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. SCAQMD Rule 402 requires that air pollutant emissions should not create a nuisance off-site. SCAQMD Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with the best available control measures so the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. Two options are presented in Rule 403; monitoring of particulate concentrations or active control. Monitoring involves a sampling network around the project with no additional control measures unless specified concentrations are exceeded. The active control option does not require any monitoring, but requires that a list of measures be implemented starting with the first day of construction.

Rule 403 requires that "A person conducting active operations within the boundaries of the South Coast Air Basin shall utilize one or more of the applicable best available control measures to minimize fugitive dust emissions from each fugitive dust source type which is part of the active operation." Rule 403 also requires that the construction activities "shall not cause or allow PM<sub>10</sub> levels to exceed 50 micrograms per cubic meter when determined by simultaneous sampling, as the difference between upwind and down wind sample." A project is exempt from the monitoring requirement "if the dust control actions, as specified in Table 2 are implemented on a routine basis for each

applicable fugitive dust source type." Table 2 from Rule 403 is presented below as Table 5-1. Under high wind conditions (i.e., when wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour) additional control measures are required, and "the required control measures for high wind conditions are implemented for each applicable fugitive dust source type, as specified in Table 1." Table 1 from Rule 403 is presented below as Table 5-2. Monitoring of particulate concentrations does not reduce fugitive dust emissions; therefore, to minimize fugitive dust emissions the construction activities will utilize the measures presented in Table 5-2 and Table 5-1 (Tables 1 and 2 in Rule 403) rather than the monitoring option of SCAQMD Rule 403.

Further, Rule 403 requires that the project shall "prevent or remove within one hour the track-out of bulk material onto public paved roadways as a result of their operations." Alternatively, the project can "take at least one of the actions listed in Table 3." Table 3 from Rule 403 is presented below as Table 5-3. In addition, the project would be required to "prevent the track-out of bulk material onto public paved roadways as a result of their operations and remove such material at anytime track-out extends for a cumulative distance of greater than 50 feet on to any paved public road during active operations; and remove all visible roadway dust tracked-out upon public paved roadways as a result of active operations at the conclusion of each work day when active operations cease.

**TABLE 5-1  
FUGITIVE DUST CONTROL ACTIONS FOR EXEMPTION TO MONITORING  
(RULE 403 TABLE 2)**

Source Category	Control Actions
<b>Earth-moving (except construction cutting and filling areas, and mining operations)</b>	<p>(1a) Maintain soil moisture content at a minimum of 12 percent, as determined by ASTM method D-2216, or other equivalent method approved by the Executive Officer, the California Air Resources Board, and the USEPA. Two soil moisture evaluations must be conducted during the first three hours of active operations during a calendar day, and two such evaluations each subsequent four-hour period of active operations; OR</p> <p>(1a-1) For any earth-moving which is more than 100 feet from all property lines, conduct watering as necessary to prevent visible dust emissions from exceeding 100 feet in length in any direction.</p>
<b>Earth-moving: Construction fill areas</b>	<p>(1b) Maintain soil moisture content at a minimum of 12 percent, as determined by ASTM method D-2216, or other equivalent method approved by the Executive Officer, the California Air Resources Board, and the USEPA. For areas which have an optimum moisture content for compaction of less than 12 percent, as determined by ASTM Method 1557 or other equivalent method approved by the Executive Officer and the California Air Resources Board and the USEPA, complete the compaction process as expeditiously as possible after achieving at least 70 percent of the optimum soil moisture content. Two soil moisture evaluations must be conducted during the first three hours of active operations during a calendar day, and two such evaluations during each subsequent four-hour period of active operations.</p>
<b>Earth-moving: Construction cut areas and mining operations</b>	<p>(1c) Conduct watering as necessary to prevent visible emissions from extending more than 100 feet beyond the active cut or mining area unless the area is inaccessible to watering vehicles due to slope conditions or other safety factors.</p>
<b>Disturbed surface areas (except completed grading areas)</b>	<p>(2a/b) Apply dust suppression in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface. Any areas which cannot be stabilized, as evidenced by wind driven fugitive dust must have an application of water at least twice per day to at least 80 percent of the unstabilized area.</p>
<b>Disturbed surface areas: Completed grading areas</b>	<p>(2c) Apply chemical stabilizers within five working days of grading completion; OR</p> <p>(2d) Take actions (3a) or (3c) specified for inactive disturbed surface areas</p>
<b>Inactive disturbed surface areas</b>	<p>(3a) Apply water to at least 80 percent of all inactive disturbed surface areas on a daily basis when there is evidence of wind driven fugitive dust, excluding any areas which are inaccessible to watering vehicles due to excessive slope or other safety conditions; OR</p>

Source Category	Control Actions
	<p>(3b) Apply dust suppressants in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface; OR</p> <p>(3c) Establish a vegetative ground cover within 21 days after active operations have ceased. Ground cover must be of sufficient density to expose less than 30 percent of unstabilized ground within 90 days of planting, and at all times thereafter; OR</p> <p>(3d) Utilize any combination of control actions (3a), (3b), and (3c) such that, in total, these actions apply to all inactive disturbed surface areas.</p>
<b>Unpaved Roads</b>	<p>(4a) Water all roads used for any vehicular traffic at least once per every two hours of active operations; OR</p> <p>(4b) Water all roads used for any vehicular traffic once daily and restrict vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour; OR</p> <p>(4c) Apply a chemical stabilizer to all unpaved road surfaces in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface.</p>
<b>Open storage piles</b>	<p>(5a) Apply chemical stabilizers; OR</p> <p>(5b) Apply water to at least 80 percent of the surface area of all open storage piles on a daily basis when there is evidence of wind driven fugitive dust; OR</p> <p>(5c) Install temporary coverings; OR</p> <p>(5d) Install a three-sided enclosure with walls with no more than 50 percent porosity which extends, at a minimum, to the top of the pile.</p>
<b>All Categories</b>	<p>(6a) Any other control measures approved by the Executive Officer and the USEPA as equivalent to the methods specified in Table 2 may be used.</p>

**TABLE 5-2  
REQUIRED BEST AVAILABLE CONTROL MEASURES  
(SCAQMD RULE 403, TABLE 1)**

Control Measure		Guidance
<b>Backfilling</b>		
01-1	Stabilize backfill material when not actively handling; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mix backfill soil with water prior to moving</li> <li>• Dedicate water truck or high capacity hose to backfilling equipment</li> <li>• Empty loader bucket slowly so that no dust plumes are generated</li> <li>• Minimize drop height from loader bucket</li> </ul>
01-2	Stabilize backfill material during handling; and	
01-3	Stabilize soil at completion of activity.	
<b>Clearing and Grubbing</b>		
02-1	Maintain stability of soil through pre-watering of site prior to clearing and grubbing; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain live perennial vegetation where possible</li> <li>• Apply water in sufficient quantity to prevent generation of dust plumes</li> </ul>
02-2	Stabilize soil during clearing and grubbing activities; and	
02-3	Stabilize soil immediately after clearing and grubbing activities.	
<b>Clearing Forms</b>		
03-1	Use water spray to clear forms; or	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of high pressure air to clear forms may cause exceedance of Rule requirements</li> </ul>
03-2	Use sweeping and water spray to clear forms; or	
03-3	Use vacuum system to clear forms.	
<b>Crushing</b>		
04-1	Stabilize surface soils prior to operation of support equipment; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Follow permit conditions for crushing equipment</li> <li>• Pre-water material prior to loading into crusher</li> <li>• Monitor crusher emissions opacity</li> <li>• Apply water to crushed material to prevent dust plumes</li> </ul>
04-2	Stabilize material after crushing.	
<b>Cut and Fill</b>		
05-1	Pre-water soils prior to cut and fill activities; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For large sites, pre-water with sprinklers or water trucks and allow time for penetration</li> <li>• Use water trucks/pulls to water soils to depth of cut prior to subsequent cuts</li> </ul>
05-2	Stabilize soil during and after cut and fill activities.	
<b>Demolition – Mechanical/Manual</b>		
06-1	Stabilize wind erodible surfaces to reduce dust; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply water in sufficient quantities to prevent the generation of visible dust plumes</li> </ul>
06-2	Stabilize surface soil where support equipment and vehicles will operate; and	
06-3	Stabilize loose soil and demolition debris; and	
06-4	Comply with AQMD Rule 1403.	
<b>Disturbed Soil</b>		
07-1	Stabilize disturbed soil throughout the construction site; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit vehicular traffic and disturbances on soils where possible</li> <li>• If interior block walls are planned, install as early as possible</li> <li>• Apply water or a stabilizing agent in sufficient quantities to prevent the generation of visible dust plumes</li> </ul>
07-02	Stabilize disturbed soil between structures	
<b>Earth-Moving Activities</b>		
08-1	Pre-apply water to depth of proposed cuts; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade each project phase separately, timed to coincide with construction phase</li> <li>• Upwind fencing can prevent material movement on site</li> <li>• Apply water or a stabilizing agent in sufficient quantities to prevent the generation of visible dust plumes</li> </ul>
08-2	Re-apply water as necessary to maintain soils in a damp condition and to ensure that visible emissions do not exceed 100 feet in any direction; and	
08-3	Stabilize soils once earth-moving activities are complete.	
<b>Importing/Exporting of Bulk Materials</b>		

Control Measure		Guidance
09-1	Stabilize material while loading to reduce fugitive dust emissions; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use tarps or other suitable enclosures on haul trucks</li> <li>• Check belly-dump truck seals regularly and remove any trapped rocks to prevent spillage</li> <li>• Comply with track-out prevention/mitigation requirements</li> <li>• Provide water while loading and unloading to reduce visible dust plumes</li> </ul>
09-2	Maintain at least six inches of freeboard on haul vehicles; and	
09-3	Stabilize material while transporting to reduce fugitive dust emissions; and	
09-4	Stabilize material while unloading to reduce fugitive dust emissions; and	
09-5	Comply with Vehicle Code Section 23114.	
<b>Landscaping</b>		
10-1	Stabilize soils, materials, slopes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply water to materials to stabilize, maintain materials in a crusted condition</li> <li>• Maintain effective cover over materials</li> <li>• Stabilize sloping surfaces using soil binders until vegetation or ground cover can effectively stabilize the slopes</li> <li>• Hydroseed prior to rain season</li> </ul>
<b>Road Shoulder Maintenance</b>		
11-1	Apply water to unpaved shoulders prior to clearing; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Installation of curbing and/or paving of road shoulders can reduce recurring maintenance costs</li> <li>• Use of chemical dust suppressants can inhibit vegetation growth and reduce future road shoulder maintenance costs</li> </ul>
11-2	Apply chemical dust suppressants and/or washed gravel to maintain a stabilized surface after completing road shoulder maintenance.	
<b>Screening</b>		
12-1	Pre-water material prior to screening; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dedicate water truck or high capacity hose to screening operation</li> <li>• Drop material through the screen slowly and minimize drop height</li> <li>• Install wind barrier with a porosity of no more than 50% upwind of screen to the height of the drop point</li> </ul>
12-2	Limit fugitive dust emissions to opacity and plume length standards; and	
12-3	Stabilize material immediately after screening.	
<b>Staging Areas</b>		
13-1	Stabilize staging areas during use; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit size of staging area</li> <li>• Limit vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour</li> <li>• Limit number and size of staging area entrances/exits</li> </ul>
13-2	Stabilize staging area soils at project completion.	
<b>Stockpiles/Bulk Material Handling</b>		
14-1	Stabilize stockpiled materials.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add or remove material from the downwind portion of the storage pile</li> <li>• Maintain storage piles to avoid steep sides or faces</li> </ul>
14-2	Stockpiles within 100 yards of off-site occupied buildings must not be greater than eight feet in height; or must have a road graded to the top to allow water truck access or must have an operational water irrigation system that is capable of complete stockpile coverage.	
<b>Traffic Areas for Construction Activities</b>		
15-1	Stabilize all off-road traffic and parking areas; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply gravel/paving to all haul routes as soon as possible to all future roadway areas</li> <li>• Barriers can be used to ensure vehicles are only used on established parking areas/haul routes</li> </ul>
15-2	Stabilize all haul routes; and	
15-3	Direct construction traffic over established haul routes.	
<b>Trenching</b>		
16-1	Stabilize surface soils where trencher or excavator and support equipment will operate; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-watering of soils prior to trenching is an effective preventive measure.</li> <li>• For deep trenching activities, pre-trench to 18 inches, soak soils via the pre-trench and resume trenching</li> <li>• Washing mud and soils from equipment at the conclusion of trenching activities to prevent crusting and drying of soil on equipment</li> </ul>
16.2	Stabilize soils at the completion of trenching activities.	
<b>Truck Loading</b>		

Control Measure		Guidance
17-1	Pre-water material prior to loading; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Empty loader bucket such that no visible dust plumes are created</li> <li>• Ensure that the loader bucket is close to the truck to minimize drop height while loading</li> </ul>
17.2	Ensure that freeboard exceeds six inches (CVC 23114)	
<b>Turf Overseeding</b>		
18-1	Apply sufficient water immediately prior to conducting turf vacuuming activities to meet opacity and plume length standards; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Haul waste material immediately off-site</li> </ul>
18-2	Cover haul vehicles prior to exiting the site.	
<b>Unpaved Roads/Parking Lots</b>		
19-1	Stabilize soils to meet the applicable performance standards; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restricting vehicular access to established unpaved travel paths and parking lots can reduce stabilization requirements</li> </ul>
19-2	Limit vehicular travel to established unpaved roads (haul routes) and unpaved parking lots.	
<b>Vacant Land</b>		
20-1	In instances where vacant lots are 0.10 acre or larger and have a cumulative area of 500 square feet or more that are driven over and/or used by motor vehicles and/or off-road vehicles, prevent motor vehicle and/or off-road vehicle trespassing, parking and/or access by installing barriers, curbs, fences, gates, posts, signs, shrubs, trees or other effective control measures.	

**TABLE 5-3  
TRACK OUT CONTROL OPTIONS**

(1)	Pave or apply chemical stabilization at sufficient concentration and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface starting from the point of intersection with the public paved surface, and extending for a centerline distance of at least 100 feet and a width of at least 20 feet.
(2)	Pave from the point of intersection with the public paved road surface, and extending for a centerline distance of at least 25 feet and a width of at least 20 feet, and install a track-out control device immediately adjacent to the paved surface such that exiting vehicles do not travel on any unpaved road surface after passing through the track-out control device.
(3)	Any other control measures approved by the Executive Officer and the USEPA as equivalent to the methods specified in Table 3 may be used.

MM 3.2-1 The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce general contractors to ensure that all equipment is properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.

MM 3.2-2 The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce general contractors to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions. During construction, engines on trucks and vehicles in loading and unloading queues will be turned off when not in use, to reduce vehicle emissions. Construction activities should be phased and scheduled to avoid emissions peaks and discontinued during second-stage smog alerts.

MM 3.2-5 During construction, the City shall coordinate with the contractor to maximize the ability to power construction activity utilizing electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel or gasoline power generators, to the extent possible.

MM 3.2-6 The contract specifications shall require that all on-site mobile equipment used during construction shall be powered by alternative fuel sources (i.e., methanol, natural gas, propane, or butane) where feasible.

MM 3.2-7 During construction, the City shall provide a location and require the contractor to store all construction equipment used in the project construction within the project site (away from adjacent residential areas) to reduce the impact on the roadway system and the resultant air emissions.

On-site construction equipment staging areas and construction worker parking lots shall be located on either paved surfaces or unpaved surfaces that are periodically treated with non-toxic soil stabilizers.

MM 3.2-9 The contract specifications shall require all on-site heavy-duty construction equipment shall be equipped with diesel particulate traps to the extent that this equipment is available at the time the contracts are awarded.

MM 3.2-10 The construction specifications shall require and the City shall enforce that emulsified diesel fuel be used in diesel-fueled construction equipment that is not equipped with diesel particulate traps to reduce NO<sub>x</sub> emissions.

MM 3.2-10a During construction of the Proposed Project, the City and its contractors shall be required to comply with the following provisions, where feasible, to reduce construction NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC emissions:

- Provide on-site lunch trucks/facilities during construction to reduce off-site worker vehicle trips.
- Prohibit construction vehicles idling in excess of five minutes to be consistent with State law.
- Suspend use of all construction equipment during a first-stage smog alert.
- Designate a person who will ensure implementation of the proposed mitigation measures through direct inspection and investigation of complaints. The City or the contractor shall provide a telephone number that residents may call should they have complaints regarding construction nuisance.

MM 3.2-10b During construction of the Proposed Project, the City and its contractors shall be required to comply with the following provisions, where feasible, to reduce construction VOC emissions:

- Use zero VOC content architectural coatings on buildings.
- Restrict the number of gallons of coatings used per day.
- Encourage water-based coatings or other low-emitting alternatives.
- Paint contractors should use hand applications instead of spray guns.

MM 3.2-17 The City will require street cleaning of Douglas Drive with a vacuum type street sweeper at least once per week. The vacuum sweeper will make sufficient circuits through the terminal area to vacuum the entire street surface (not just the gutter area) to reduce fugitive PM emissions from re-entrained road dust. Douglas Drive between Lakewood Boulevard and the Long Beach Airport terminal (including the loop in front of the terminal and return) shall be cleaned in this manner. The anticipated future exit road back to Lakewood Boulevard would also be cleaned in this manner.

The range of potential control efficiencies for this mitigation measure is from approximately 10 percent to 50 percent.<sup>1,2</sup> It is anticipated that a 75 percent reduction would be needed to reduce the peak incremental PM<sub>10</sub> concentration below the significance threshold; therefore, PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations would remain significant after implementation of this mitigation measure.

## **6.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

The cumulative impacts analysis evaluated the potential impacts to the environment that could be associated with implementation of the Proposed Project in concert with the cumulative projects and projected growth for the region. To provide a comprehensive evaluation of the potential cumulative impacts for the Long Beach Airport Terminal Improvements project, the cumulative impacts analyses contained in the EIR consider the General Plan and regional growth assumptions for the project study area, as well as specific projects (hereafter referred to as "specific projects"). The specific projects were cumulative projects identified for the Douglas Park EIR, which was updated with projects identified by the Cities of Signal Hill and Lakewood. The listings of the specific projects were included in Appendix H of the FEIR. The planning horizon year used for the cumulative analysis is year 2020.

### **6.1 Cumulative Effects Determined Not to Be Significant**

This section of the findings summarizes the potential effects found not to be significant upon implementation of the Proposed Project. The summary of the environmental effects found not to be significant is based on the environmental analysis provided in the EIR, Section 5.0, Long Term Implications of the Proposed Project. The project is anticipated to result in the following impacts that are not significant:

#### **6.1.1 Aesthetic Cumulative Impacts**

**Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in any significant, cumulative Aesthetic Impacts.

**Facts In Support of Finding:** The Proposed Project, because of its location, would not be within the same viewshed as other development projects within the area. The improvements within the terminal area are set within the Airport Entrance area, and the Parcel O improvements are along the southern portion of the Airport limits. There are no other development projects being considered which would substantially alter view of these areas. When considered on a broader scale, the combining of these projects would also not change the community character. The project site is already completely developed and is located in an urbanized area. Therefore, the Proposed Project, in combination with other known projects, would not substantially change the developed environment, nor would they degrade the existing visual character of the area.

#### **6.1.2 Cultural Resources Cumulative Impacts**

**Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in any significant, Cumulative Cultural resources Impacts.

**Facts In Support of Finding:** Given the nature of the impact associated with the Proposed Project, there are no reasonably anticipated projects that would contribute to a cumulative impact on the Terminal Building as a historical resource. Additionally, the Terminal Building is

<sup>1</sup> Cowherd, C., P. Englehart, G.E. Muleski, J.S. Kinsey, and K.D. Rosbury, 1990. Control of Fugitive and Hazardous Dusts, Noyes Data Corporation, Park Ridge, NJ. p.21.

<sup>2</sup> "Improvement of Specific Emission Factors (BACM Project No. 1) Final Report," by Midwest Research Institute for SCAQMD, Diamond Bar, CA, March 29, 1996.

the only designated historical landmark within the project vicinity. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not contributing to cumulative modifications of designated historical landmarks in the project vicinity.

### **6.1.3 Hazardous and Hazardous Materials Cumulative Impacts**

**Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in any significant, cumulative Hazards and Hazardous Materials impacts.

**Facts In Support of Finding:** Given the age of the development within the area surrounding the Airport, it is likely that future projects may result in impacts similar in nature to the impacts identified for the Proposed Project. Although cumulative projects, such as Douglas Park, also have potential impacts associated with hazardous materials, the environmental concerns associated with hazardous materials are site specific. Each project is required to address any issues related to hazardous materials or wastes. Federal, state, and local regulations require mitigation to protect against site contamination by hazardous materials. Therefore, there would be no cumulative hazardous materials impacts.

### **6.1.4 Land Use and Relevant Planning Cumulative Impacts**

**Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in any significant, cumulative Land Use and Relevant Planning impacts.

**Facts In Support of Finding:** Compared to existing conditions, the Proposed Project would not result in any off-site impacts. Given the very use-specific nature of the Proposed Project (on airport development) other specific projects identified would not contribute impacts similar in nature which would result in cumulative impacts either on or off airport property. No significant cumulative Land Use impacts would occur.

### **6.2.5 Noise Cumulative Impacts**

**Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in any significant cumulative noise impacts.

**Facts In Support of Finding:** The Proposed Project would potentially result in night construction activity on Parcel O. If heavy construction equipment associated with grading and paving are used during nighttime hours, it may result in noise levels in excess of the noise levels specified in the Long Beach Noise Ordinance. There are no other specific projects that have been identified that would contribute to this potential impact, thereby resulting in a significant cumulative impact. Additionally, there are no other specific projects or regional projections that would result in additive noise levels associated with aircraft noise. Though not related to the Proposed Project, there would continue to be sensitive land uses within the 65 CNEL contour from the Airport. The Proposed Project does recommend the development of a Land Use Compatibility Program that would address this existing noise condition. Therefore, there would be no significant cumulative impact.

### **6.2.6 Public Services Cumulative Impacts**

**Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in any significant cumulative Public Services impacts.

**Facts In Support of Finding:** The nature of the Proposed Project differentiates it from other specific projects or development that may occur because of growth within the region. The needs of the Airport are distinct with regards to security and fire protection. The Airport provides these services on site. The services on site would not respond to emergencies within the community.

Therefore, cumulative projects and growth would not contribute to the same type of demand as the Proposed Project. Therefore, there would be no significant cumulative impact.

### 6.2.7 Transportation and Circulation Cumulative Impacts

**Finding:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in any significant, cumulative Transportation and Circulation impacts.

**Facts In Support of Finding:** The traffic model used for calculating the 2020 Proposed Project impacts utilizes the growth assumptions adopted by SCAG, as well as traffic associated with the other specific projects. These long-range projections account for potential cumulative impacts. The analysis indicates there would not be a cumulative impact in 2020. Additionally, the Proposed Project would only contribute a minimal amount of additional traffic to the roadway network. There would be no significant cumulative impacts.

## 6.2 Significant Cumulative Effects That Cannot Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance

### 6.2.1 Air Quality Cumulative Impacts

**Significant Effects:** Construction-related air emissions would contribute to significant short-term, cumulative Air Quality impacts.

**Findings:** The Planning Commission adopts the following CEQA Findings:

- *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.*
- *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the Environmental Impact Report.*

**Facts In Support of Findings:** The Douglas Park project is immediately north of the Airport. According to the Douglas Park EIR (City of Long Beach 2004), construction emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) were significant. The location of the Douglas Park project is considered to be in close enough proximity to the Proposed Project that the emissions would combine. It is also reasonable to assume that the timing of the Proposed Project and Douglas Park would occur simultaneously. Therefore, it is rational to assume that in addition to significant project-related construction Air Quality impacts, there would be significant cumulative construction Air Quality impacts. Though both projects would be required to implement a mitigation program to reduce the construction emissions, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The identified significant effects of the Project have been reduced or avoided to the extent feasible through the implementation of the mitigation measures that have been adopted and incorporated into the Proposed Project, as outlined in Section 5.1.1 of these Findings. However, the impacts cannot be feasibly mitigated to below a level of significance. The remaining significant effects are acceptable because of the specified overriding economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

## 7.0 FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

### 7.1 Introduction

Per Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines:

An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.

As described in the Draft EIR, Section 2.4, Project History, the City conducted an extensive scoping process the scope of the project and the analysis to develop in the EIR. Through that process, a range of alternatives were identified and the Proposed Project was selected. Each of the identified alternatives would provide reduced terminal improvements. The EIR compared and contrasted the potential environmental impacts of the alternatives.

Because the Proposed Project will result in some significant unavoidable environmental effects, as outlined above, the City must consider the feasibility of environmentally superior alternatives to the project. In taking action on the Proposed Project, the City must evaluate whether such alternatives could avoid or substantially lessen the significant unavoidable environmental effects. If the City of Long Beach finds that the project alternatives are not feasible, it must, before approving the project, adopt findings including a Statement of Overriding Considerations with regard to the project which set forth the factors that warrant approval of the project despite the existence of adverse environmental impacts. The EIR must focus its alternatives analysis on alternatives that "could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project". However, the CEQA Guidelines also require an EIR to examine alternatives "capable of avoiding or lessening" environmental effects even if these alternatives "would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly." (Guidelines §15126.6[b].)

CEQA provides the following definition of the term "feasible" as it applies to the findings requirement: "Feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." PRC §21081 provides, in part:

...[N]o public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless both the following occur: (a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant effect:

...

(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly-trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

The concept of "feasibility," therefore, as it applies to findings, involves a balancing of various economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.<sup>3</sup>

These findings contrast and compare the alternatives, where appropriate, to show that the selection of the project, while still resulting in significant environmental impacts, has substantial environmental, planning, fiscal, and other benefits. In rejecting certain alternatives, the City has examined both the environmental impacts and the project objectives and weighed the ability of the various alternatives to meet the objectives. The City of Long Beach finds, after due consideration of a reasonable range of alternatives (as set forth in the EIR and below), that the Proposed Project best attains a balance between improved passenger service at Long Beach Airport, protects against local environmental impacts, and best meets the approved objectives with the least environmental impact.

## 7.1 Alternative A

This alternative was based on the improvements proposed in the 2003 NOP, with minor modifications. Alternative A assumes the terminal facility would be a maximum of 97,545 square feet. The nature of the improvements would generally be the same as the proposed project, though compared to the proposed project, there are minor reductions in square footage in all except the following:

- Baggage security screening would be the same as the Proposed Project.
- No additional space is assumed for ticketing facilities.
- The amount of airport office space is increased compared to the Proposed Project.

The 2003 NOP assumed 16 aircraft parking spaces. However, the City Council determined in February 2005 that no more than 14 aircraft parking spaces would be evaluated in the EIR; therefore, the 16 aircraft parking spaces presented in the 2003 NOP have been reduced 14 for evaluation in the EIR. Other aspects of the project, such as the number of gates, aircraft parking, and vehicular parking would be the same for Alternative A as for the Proposed Project.

The features described for the Proposed Project, such as modification to the interior of the existing Airport Terminal Building, the relocation of general aviation aircraft to Parcel O, the LEED standards, and application of the Guiding Principles during project design would all apply to Alternative A.

Refer to Table 7-1 below for a comparison of Alternative A impacts to the Proposed Project. Further description of these impacts can be found in Section 3.0 of the EIR. This alternative represents an approximately five percent decrease in floor area. This alternative would not reduce the unavoidable Air Quality impact to a level considered less than significant. With Alternative A the peak day construction would be the same as with the Proposed Project. As a result, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. This alternative would generally meet all the project objectives; however, the ability to meet the ticketing demands of the 4.2 MAP would be less than the Proposed Project because no additional capacity is being provided for this use. This scenario was found to be a feasible alternative, but was not selected because it was not environmentally superior to the Proposed Project.

## 7.2 Alternative B

<sup>3</sup> See PRC §21061.1; CEQA Guidelines § 15364; SB 919 (which amends PRC 21081 (c)). See, also, the following court cases *City of Goleta Valley vs. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 553,554-566; *City of Del Mar vs. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal. App.3d 401, 415-417.

This alternative further reduces the size of the terminal facilities. This alternative assumes the terminal facility would be a maximum of 79,725 square feet. Similar to Alternative A, the nature of the improvements would generally be the same, though reduced in size compared to the Proposed Project, with the following exceptions:

- Baggage security screening would be the same as the Proposed Project.
- No additional space is assumed for ticketing facilities.
- No additional airport office space is assumed as part of this alternative.

Other aspects of the project, such as the number of gates, aircraft parking, and vehicular parking would be the same for Alternative B as for the Proposed Project. The features described for the Proposed Project, such as modification to the interior of the existing Airport Terminal Building, the relocation of general aviation aircraft to Parcel O, the LEED standards, and application of the Guiding Principles during project design would all apply to Alternative B.

This alternative would represent an approximately 22 percent decrease in square footage compared to the Proposed Project. The EIR findings determined the impacts associated with this alternative would be very similar to those associated with the Proposed Project. Refer to Table 7-1 for a comparison of Alternative B impacts to the Proposed Project. Further description of these impacts can be found in Section 3.0 of the EIR.

This alternative would not reduce the unavoidable Air Quality impact to a level considered less than significant. With Alternative B the peak day construction would be the same as with the Proposed Project. As a result, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. This alternative would meet the project objectives as effectively as the Proposed Project. Sizing recommendations done by HNTB as part of the project scoping process, identified size parameters for various uses based on industry standards and code requirements. The reduction of approximately 23,000 square feet would fall below the sizing parameters. Additionally, this alternative does not provide for additional airport office space, a need identified by the airport, the airlines, and TSA. Additionally, this alternative would also have limitations in its ability to meet the ticketing demands of the 4.2 MAP because there is no new space allocation for this use. This scenario was found to be a feasible alternative, but was not selected because it was not environmentally superior to the Proposed Project.

### **7.3 Alternative C (No Project Alternative)**

Alternative C represents the No Project Alternative, which assumes that no new facilities would be provided at the Airport. The temporary holdrooms provided at the Airport would remain in place. The terminal, including holdrooms, would be a total of 56,320 square feet. The airline gates would be limited to the eight that currently exist. A total of ten aircraft parking spaces would be provided at the Airport. The parking would be limited to the parking available on site. This would include the existing parking structure and surface parking. The spaces that are currently leased off site would not be available because of the short-term nature of the leases. Based on recent discussions, Boeing has indicated the leases would not be available on a long-term basis. Since no new vehicular parking spaces would be provided, this alternative would have a net loss of approximately 2,100 parking spaces compared to current conditions.

Refer to Table 7-1 for a comparison of Alternative C impacts to the Proposed Project. Further description of these impacts can be found in Section 3.0 of the EIR. This alternative would eliminate all the construction-related impacts, including the significant, unavoidable impact on Air Quality. However, this alternative would not have any of the benefits of the Proposed Project, such as the long-term air quality benefits associated with electrification of the ground support equipment (GSE).

This alternative would reduce the impacts compared to the Proposed Project; however, it does not effectively meet the project objectives and therefore would not be feasible, as it applies to these Findings. A key objective is to maximize safety and security of passengers, visitors, and tenants by adhering to TSA, FAA, and all other applicable state and local standards including the City's fire, building, and safety codes. This alternative would not be able to meet the requirements of TSA, which has identified a need for additional enclosed space to adequately carry out their mission of providing security screening at the Airport. Additionally, the Airport currently experiences overcrowding during peak hours, which compromises its ability to effectively meet space requirements. As the commuter flights are added, Alternative C would also not be able to meet the second objective which calls for ensuring that project sizing and design of the improvements is in keeping with the parameters of the adopted Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance provides for a minimum of 41 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights. The full utilization of the minimum number of flights is expected to increase the number of passengers at the Airport from the 3.0 MAP in 2003 to approximately 4.2 MAP. This potential 37 percent increase in the number of passengers being served would further tax the existing facilities, which were not designed to accommodate this passenger level. Finally, this alternative would not meet the objective of providing an uncomplicated; operationally; and energy-efficient, value-driven design within a plan that can be developed in incremental stages. This alternative does not provide for the phasing of any new facilities. With the current use of temporary facilities, the ability to introduce any expansion is limited because of the cluttered nature of the building layouts.

This alternative was not found to be environmentally superior and was not selected because it was not found to be feasible as it applies to these Findings.

#### **7.4 Alternative D**

Alternative D proposed a rollback in square footage from existing conditions. This alternative assumed no new facilities and proposed the removal of the existing temporary facilities currently in use at the Airport. Terminal facilities would be reduced to 34,570 square feet. Parking would be reduced to 2,835 vehicle spaces. This alternative was found not to be a feasible alternative because it does not effectively meet the project objectives. Additionally, this alternative would not provide the beneficial effects of the project, such as the air quality benefits associated with electrification of the GSE. This project was not carried forward for further evaluation in the EIR. This alternative would experience all of the same shortcomings of the No Project Alternative but would exacerbate the problems because temporary facilities would also be removed. This alternative would not meet the project objectives, is not environmentally superior, and is not feasible as it applies to these Findings.

#### **7.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative**

None of the Build Alternatives are able to eliminate the significant, unavoidable, construction-related Air Quality impacts. As a result, the evaluation of the environmentally superior alternative focuses on each alternative ability to meet the project objectives. Each of the alternatives (including the Proposed Project) would provide additional capacity that would help serve the number of passengers served by the minimum number of flights provided for in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. However, based on the HNTB study (2004) conducted during the scoping process, the recommended sizes of the facilities to best meet the needs for the passengers, visitors, and tenants actually exceeded the square footage allocation of even the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project is able to meet all the project objectives, including complying with the parameters of the adopted Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance; it will maintain the current character of the Airport Terminal Building as a Long Beach Cultural Heritage Landmark; and it will construct an operationally and energy-efficient, value-driven design. The Proposed Project does not result in substantially greater impacts than the other build alternatives. Therefore, the Proposed Project is the environmentally superior alternative.

Another consideration when selecting the environmentally superior alternative is the consideration on the number of aircraft parking positions. The Proposed Project was evaluated with 14 parking positions. The project description identifies between 12 and 14 parking positions. However, the reduction to 12 parking positions would potentially result in an increase in air quality emissions. Based on Department of Transportation data, approximately 15 percent of the arrivals at the Airport are late. When aircraft arrive late during peak hours, there would not be an available parking position at the terminal. As a result, the aircraft would need to wait until a position becomes available. In those cases the overall air emissions would increase from aircraft idling. The Proposed Project does not result in substantially greater impacts than the other build alternatives. Therefore, the Proposed Project is the environmentally superior alternative.

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF IMPACTS BY ALTERNATIVE**

Impacts	Proposed Project	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C (No Project)
<b>Aesthetics</b>				
The Proposed Project would alter views of the project site during construction activities, potentially resulting in short-term aesthetic impacts in the vicinity of the terminal.	Mitigated to less than significant	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	No Impact
The Proposed Project would result in construction activities and expansion of the terminal facilities. This could result in light and glare impacts associated with security lighting and light emanating from the proposed improvements.	Mitigated to less than significant	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	No Impact
<b>Air Quality and Human Health Risk Assessment</b>				
Project-related construction activities would result in a significant short-term construction-related air quality impact for NO <sub>x</sub> and VOC.	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts similar in nature because the type of construction activities would be the same. Also, significant and unavoidable.	Impacts similar in nature because the type of construction activities would be the same. Also, significant and unavoidable.	No Impact
<b>Cultural Resources</b>				
The Proposed Project would result in alterations to a designated historical landmark.	Mitigated to less than significant	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	No Impact
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>				
During construction, asbestos-containing materials could be disturbed and introduced into the environment.	Mitigated to less than significant	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	No impact.
During construction, lead-based paint could be introduced into the environment.	Mitigated to less than significant	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	No impact.
During grading activities at Parcel O, aerially-deposited lead could be introduced into the environment.	Mitigated to less than significant	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	No impact.
During grading activities at Parcel O, DDT could be introduced into the environment.	Mitigated to less than significant	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	No impact.
During construction, hazardous materials could be transported onto the Airport along established haul routes, including Willow Street.	Mitigated to less than significant	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	No impact.
<b>Land Use and Relevant Planning</b>				
No significant land use and relevant planning impacts were identified in conjunction with the Proposed Project or any of the alternatives.	No Impact.	No Impact.	No Impact.	No Impact.

Impacts	Proposed Project	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C (No Project)
<b>Noise</b>				
No significant impacts were identified. All the alternatives would comply with the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance.	No impact; however, a land use compatibility program is proposed to address those sensitive uses currently within the 65 CNEL contour.	No impact; however, a land use compatibility program is proposed to address those sensitive uses currently within the 65 CNEL contour.	No impact; however, a land use compatibility program is proposed to address those sensitive uses currently within the 65 CNEL contour.	No impact; however, no mitigation is proposed with the No Project Alternative.
Night construction activity on Parcel O may result in noise levels in excess of the noise levels specified in the Long Beach Noise Ordinance if heavy construction equipment associated with grading and paving are used.	Mitigated to less than significant.	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	Impacts similar in nature. Also, mitigated to less than significant.	No impact.
<b>Public Services</b>				
No impacts were identified. The project would have beneficial effects of providing additional capacity for security. Service issues associated with overcrowding would be reduced.	Beneficial	Beneficial	Beneficial	Overcrowding would continue. Based on current flight levels this would be adverse but not significant.
<b>Transportation and Circulation</b>				
No significant traffic impacts were identified for the existing plus project scenario.	No Impact.	No Impact.	No Impact.	No Impact.
There would be insufficient parking at the Airport to service the projected number of passengers.	This would not apply to the Proposed Project, but would be applicable to the Optimized Flights scenario. Mitigated to less than significant	Impacts similar in nature. This impact would only apply to the Optimized Flights scenario. Mitigated to less than significant.	Impacts similar in nature. This impact would only apply to the Optimized Flights scenario. Mitigated to less than significant.	Impacts would be substantially greater because no additional parking is proposed and the current leased parking would not be available in the 2020 timeframe. This would apply to with and without Optimized Flights. This would be a significant unavoidable impact.

## 8.0 OPTIMIZED FLIGHTS

The Planning Commission adopts the finding described below:

The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, which became part of the *Long Beach Municipal Code (LBMC)* in 1995, has provisions to increase the number of flights over the minimum 41 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights provided that the flights can be added without airlines or commuters exceeding their allocated portion of the CNEL noise budget based on the baseline years 1989 to 1990. The air carrier and commuter noise budget assessment is conducted annually based on the October 1 through September 30 timeframe, with City Council action required on or before November 15 of each year. Effective dates for any incremental flight increases would be January 1 of the following year.

Additionally flights would only be feasible if the airlines optimized their flight operations through methods such as using quieter aircraft and reducing the number of late night operations. To date, this has never been accomplished at the Airport. Implementation of the terminal area improvements is not a criteria for the Optimized Flights, and the Proposed Project would not facilitate the airlines in meeting the required noise reduction. The City Council directed that the EIR also address the potential impacts associated with an increase in the number of flights, as well as the full utilization of the minimum 25 commuter flights.

The purpose of this analysis was to respond to the community's request for information on what the impacts associated with an increase in the number of flights would be. There was a component of the community that requested an evaluation of flight levels if the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance was revoked. Revocation of the Ordinance was deemed to be too speculative since there was no indication that any of the parties involved were interested in such an action. The City Council has continued to voice support of the Ordinance; the airlines operating at the Airport have voiced support of the Ordinance; and the FAA has reaffirmed the Airport's "grandfathered" status pursuant to the Airport Noise Capacity Act (ANCA). Therefore, an analysis that assumed optimization of flights within the parameters of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance provided the most sound approach in providing the type of evaluation the community requested. Though an increase in the number of flights is allowable under the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance regardless of any action on this project, it would not be considered a readily foreseeable action because the airlines have not ever met the criteria for increasing the number of flights.

The assumptions used to develop this analysis were based on realistic assumptions about the fleet and time of operation as opposed to an idealized fleet, such as assuming no night operations. The analysis assumed: (1) each airline would continue to operate in its current markets; (2) each airline would use the quietest aircraft currently in its fleet or on order; (3) each airline would reduce their night operations by 50 percent from 2004 levels; and (4) all new flights would be distributed throughout the day according to the present distribution of flights with reduced night operations. Under optimal conditions, which have never been achieved at the Airport, the estimated number of increased flights would range between 7 and 11 flights. For analysis purposes, an addition of 11 air carrier flights was used. The 25 commuter flights would fill the commuter budget; there is not a foreseeable scenario in which additional commuter flights could be allocated under the budget. The City would not have any discretion on allowing the flights if the conditions outlined in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance are met.

The analysis of the 52 (41 plus 11) air carrier flights and the 25 commuter flights would result in additional impacts beyond those that would occur with the minimum flight levels allowed under the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. Though not project-related impacts, the EIR identified the potential impacts and made recommendations on potential mitigation measures. The additional impact associated with the Optimized Flights Scenario would include:

- Incremental air quality emissions with the Optimized Flights would exceed SCAQMD's PM<sub>10</sub> concentration threshold due to associated GSE and vehicular traffic activity; contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation; and expose sensitive receptors to significant PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations. Implementation of the mitigation program presented in Section 3.2.3 would reduce these impacts, but not to a level considered less than significant.
- Air quality emissions with the Optimized Flights would exceed SCAQMD's thresholds of significance for CO and NO<sub>x</sub>. The mitigation program presented in Section 3.2.3 would reduce the CO impacts to a level considered less than significant. NO<sub>x</sub> emissions would remain significant even after implementation of the mitigation program.
- The Optimized Flights Scenario has the potential to induce airport land uses beyond the Airport boundary. Specifically, the increased flight levels would require additional vehicular parking beyond the levels provided by the Proposed Project. This impact is associated with the Optimized Flights Scenario and not the Proposed Project. Mitigation measure MM 3.8-2 would reduce this impact to a level considered less than significant.
- The Existing Plus Optimized Flights scenario would result in significant impacts at the Spring Street/Lakewood Boulevard and the Willow Street/Lakewood Boulevard intersections during the weekday a.m. peak hour. With the implementation of MM 3.8-1, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.
- With the Optimized Flights Scenario, there would be insufficient parking to accommodate the additional passenger levels. With the implementation of MM 3.8-2, this impact would be reduced to a level considered less than significant.

This information has been provided to the Planning Commission for informational purposes only. No action is recommended or required pertaining to the Optimized Flights Scenario.